

# THE

US ISSN 0010-1443

# COLONIAL NEWSLETTER

P. O. Box 4411

Huntsville, Alabama 35815

J. C. Spillman, Editor

Volume 33, No. 1

February, 1993

Serial No. 93

## IN THIS ISSUE

□ □ □

**Editorial Ramblings**  
Page 1354

**Nova Eborac Filmprint Study**  
Page 1357

**Cecil Calvert's Coinage**  
for  
**Maryland**  
Page 1360

**Benjamin Dudley**  
and the  
**Fugio Copper**  
Page 1363

**New York Theater Tokens**  
Page 1367

**More About That BLANK Planchet**  
Page 1369

**New Connecticut 49.2-Z.1**  
Page 1370

□ □ □

□

**Three  
CNL  
Patrons  
To  
Serve  
As  
Associate  
Editors**

□

**See  
Pages  
1354-1356**

□

Sequential page 1353

# MISCELLANEOUS RUMBLINGS, RAMBLINGS AND REPORTS FROM THE EDITOR.

## Shall we continue?

Toward the close of each year ye Editor takes a very hard look at the overall circumstances surrounding *The Colonial Newsletter* (CNL) and asks himself an important question "... shall we continue for another year?" Once again the question has been asked. Some of the factors considered are the response to our financial solicitations earlier in each year, the quantity of manuscripts and Technical Notes received, both long and short, the comments and attitudes gleaned from those Patrons who have taken the trouble to write or to telephone us and, especially, the general feelings that emit from all of the above regarding the satisfaction of the majority of our Patrons with the current year's progress.

Another especially important factor is ye Editor's personal situation. As many of our Patrons are aware, CNL under the direction of ye Editor has been ongoing for some 30 of the 33 years since its beginning in 1960 - - and lets face it, that is quite a long time. Both ye Editor and his wife are now fully retired from our day to day efforts to earn a living and we are discovering that other interests, such as travel and MIDI music composition, are developing as time

goes by! And, ye Editor would like to devote more time to his own numismatic research and writing, an activity that has been on the back burner for quite some-time. So the answer, today, is much more important to us personally than in the past. During our CNL experience we have made many friends and encountered some unique and often unexpected events, most of which have been pleasant ones and we look forward to their continuation!

Our primary conclusion regarding the year just past is that the editorial participation of our Patrons has decreased considerably. We no longer receive questions for the Research Forum or very much information on new finds of the sort that go to make up an issue like Serial No. 91, our July 1992 issue, about which one Patron wrote ".... Frankly, I was about to drop out. Well, I had laid Colonials aside in favor of other, very different, coin types. And, I was kind of losing interest in information on the lives of mint owners, etc. Then the July issue came along. It talked about COINS. And it talked about current finds, colonial collectors, current enigmas. Anyway, I found it interesting reading. Please keep the Newsletter coming. ... P.S. I hope YOU will do another article."

CNL No. 91 was, in ye Editor's opinion, exactly what CNL should be to satisfy the "newsletter" format as well as the general interests of most of our Patrons; however, several of the short articles that made up that issue had been in hand for more than a year awaiting the arrival of enough others to make up the issue. The longer in-depth research papers that have dominated many recent issues are fine and will provide excellent historical material for future studies, but unless one is interested in the particular subject matter of the paper the entire issue may appear as a wasted effort..

Our Patrons must remember that CNL is designed to be a participation publication! Each new member receives the following admonition from ye Editor as a part of their

introductory material:

"We also need your active participation in the form of questions for the Research Forum, your letters, observations and comments that will be useful as Technical Notes, and your papers or articles for publication. We will especially appreciate your suggestions of articles suitable for reprints. There are many worthwhile papers on "Colonial" Numismatics buried in obscure journals that can be brought out from their hiding places."

### **SO — What is the answer?**

We shall have a go at it for another year; BUT, some additional help is needed with the editorial duties! Accordingly, ye Editor has asked three of our Patrons to serve as Associate Editors who will assist in preparing material for publication and who will also attempt to locate, through personal contacts, material suitable for short articles such as made up CNL No. 91, plus whatever else they can think of that will make it easier for CNL to obtain short articles of general interest. We do not, so far, have any formal arrangements for accomplishing these objectives but they will, no doubt, work out with time.

Our three Patrons who have graciously agreed to help are:

- (1) Mike Hodder of Wolfeboro, NH
- (2) Phil Mossman of Hampden, ME
- (3) Gary Trudgen of Endwell, NY

Anyone wishing to directly contact any of the three can write to them in care of the CNL P.O.Box 4411 in Huntsville, AL 35815 and we will forward your correspondence to them.

### **And something else —**

Ye Editor was recently astounded to hear someone express the opinion that material published in CNL could be considered the "last word" on a subject! Nothing could be

further from the truth! First of all, after some 300 years of neglect the general subject of early American numismatics has only recently (within the past 50 years or so) begun to be explored in-depth. The only notable exception to this has to be the work of Sylvester S. Crosby in his "Early Coins of America ...".

Anyone who has read carefully the in-depth articles published in CNL over the years will recognize that there are many areas of disagreement between our writers, ye Editor's work included! This is especially true when it comes to the assignment of specific coins to specific die-sinkers, for example! Another area is whether certain coins are of American or British origin, and etc. Yet another concerns the technologies of die sinking and preparation of coinage blanks, or the techniques of coinage by screw or rocker press, etc. These general examples serve to illustrate my observation that there are many areas in which we have only rudimentary information and that additional years of study are going to be required before we can approach certainty on many of these questions.

It has always been ye Editor's philosophy for CNL that whenever someone has invested the time to research an early American numismatics subject and has made the effort to prepare his material for publication, that it deserves serious consideration even though some of the conclusions may conflict with the ideas of other writers. There are very few areas in the field of Early American Numismatics where certainty can be established! We attempt to minimize editorial changes and to publish papers and comments corresponding to their original form as closely as possible.

The major articles that appear in CNL represent their authors' best assessments of the historical and numismatic facts being discussed. In many cases, these studies are 'state of the art', the newest research in their fields.

Our Patrons should always remember, however, that these articles combine both facts **and** authors' interpretations of those facts. We all know that the latter are subjective and that different people can see the same facts in different ways. While there are some very complex "rules" for interpreting historical evidence, they boil down to one simple rule, 'common sense'. When you read an article, notice how the author uses and interprets the evidence and ask yourself, if you had written the article would you have come to the same conclusions based upon the same facts? If the answer is no, then perhaps you've discovered a flaw in the author's reasoning, and perhaps **you** should write a few comments regarding your opinion.

We should also not forget that our understanding of early American coins is an evolving thing and that new 'facts' about coins are always being turned up that contradict old 'facts'. Let us look at some specifics - - A good case in point is the Cecil Calvert coinage for Maryland. It was once believed that by placing his own portrait on his coins Calvert got into trouble with the Crown, and that was why the coinage was so short lived. Now we believe that it was Calvert's unlicensed exportation of silver, in the form of his struck coins, that stopped the coinage after a short time. (See the article on page 1360). Someday this current belief may change again in the light of new evidence.

Another example is the radically different way CNL Patrons Gary Trudgen and Michael Hodder deal with the problem of James F. Atlee's role in the state copper coinages. Both authors approach the same subject from different directions and come to very different conclusions. Who's right and who's wrong? Or are they both right, in their own ways? Or are they both dealing with a subject that has so little 'fact' attached that their studies are mostly interpretations of those limited 'facts'?

The articles in CNL are often 'state of the art', but remember that each new genera-

tion interprets its past in its own way. One hundred years from now these CNL articles may seem as naive as some from the *American Journal of Numismatics* do now. There are very few writers like Sylvester Crosby, whose work can stand the test of time. (And even Crosby totally missed out in some areas -- the Virginia Halfpence of 1773, for example.) Patrons should read these CNL articles for what they are, their authors' best guesses and not expect that any of them have written the final word on their subject!

Ye Editor likes to visualize the overall field of early American numismatics as a large and very complex jigsaw puzzle having many extremely convoluted pieces, missing pieces, and even some incorrect pieces mixed into the picture. The puzzle, today, is but partially assembled, in some cases even the edges are not well defined, and it may be many years before the overall picture begins to take final shape!

## IN CONCLUSION

So -- with the changes in ye Editor's personal objectives and interests resulting from the full retirement of both he and his wife, it has become necessary to make a few changes in the manner in which CNL is produced, or otherwise, simply to discontinue the publication. Perhaps it has served its' purpose within the late 1900's era! However, we hope that the addition of our three Associate Editors will herald a new era for CNL and will encourage our Patrons to participate more fully. Remember — CNL is not published for any other purpose than to serve as a vehicle for communication and an exchange of ideas between our Patrons on the subject of early American numismatics!

As always, the opinions of our Patrons will be appreciated.

NOVA EBORAC  
FILMPRINT PUNCH STUDY

by Gary A. Trudgen  
Endwell, NY

(TN-151)

The September 1991 issue of The Colonial Newsletter (No. 89) contains a 12-page paper on the Nova Eborac copper series by the author. As detailed in this paper, the series consists of four varieties which were struck from 3 obverse and 4 reverse dies. The varieties are: Crosby 1-A, or the "figure right" variety; Crosby 1-B, known as the "figure left" variety; Crosby 2-C, termed the "large head" variety; and Crosby 3-D, know as the "small head" variety. In this paper it was claimed that all four varieties were prepared by the same letter and numeral punches. If this punch linkage claim is true, it argues against the popular belief that the "small head" variety is a contemporary counterfeit, produced by a different group of coiners than the other varieties in the series. Also, in the same paper, the most likely emission sequence was established. Variety 3-D was struck first, followed by 2-C, 1-B, and then 1-A.

Recently, enlarged black & white positive transparencies, or FilmPrints, were made of each different Nova Eborac die, taken from high quality coins. Also, FilmPrints were made of a well-preserved intermediate die state "Muttonhead" Connecticut copper, Miller 1.2-C of 1787. With these FilmPrints, a careful punch comparison study was made by overlaying two transparencies at a time and viewing them by the transmitted light of a slide light table.

The FilmPrints were made by first photographing the coins using black & white 35mm film (Kodak Plus-X, ASA 125). Each coin was illuminated by two light sources, arranged so that the surface of the coin was fully illuminated. The film was developed, providing negatives of the coins. Through the use of a high-tech Canon color laser copier (with the color turned off), 8X10 inch positive transparencies were made from the negatives. The copier can be adjusted to enlarge or reduce the image size, by which means the coin images were all made to the same scale. This study was performed with images that were enlarged to 5.15 times the original coin size. The resolution of the images is very good and quite adequate for punch comparison study. However, the resolution is not quite as good as that which could be obtained through a photographic process. The advantage of the laser copier transparencies is that they are about one-fourth the cost of transparencies made by the photographic process.

The results of the study are summarized in the following table. The numeral or letter punch is listed along the left vertical axis. The Nova Eborac die varieties are given along the top horizontal axis in emission sequence order, with the obverse die on the left and reverse die on the right. Since the "figure left" and "figure right" varieties share the same obverse die, only the reverse die is listed for the "figure right" variety. A splat (\*) indicates which dies were prepared from the specified punch listed at the left of the row. The chart should be read horizontally or by rows, from left to right. Appropriate comments for each punch appear below the table. The obverse legend is NOVA EBORAC; the reverse legend is VIRT ET LIB; and the date is 1787.

## NOVA EBORAC DIES

	SMALL HEAD		LARGE HEAD		FIGURE LEFT		FIGURE RIGHT
PUNCH	3	D	2	C	1	B	A
1		*		*		*	*
7		*		*		*	*
8		*		*		*	*
N	*		*		*		
O	*		*		*		
V	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
1st A	*		*		*		
2nd A					*		
1st E	*	*	*	*			
2nd E					*	*	
3rd E							*
B	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
1st R	*	*			*		*
2nd R			*	*		*	
C	*		*		*		
I		*		*		*	*
T		*		*		*	*
L		*		*		*	*

\* This die was prepared by the punch specified at the left of this row.

**Numeral Punches:** The same three numeral punches (1, 7, 8) were used to prepare the four Nova Eborac reverse dies. Also, FilmPrint study shows that these same numeral punches were used to prepare Miller reverse C of 1787, the "Muttonhead" Connecticut copper die.

**"N" Punch:** The same wide "N" punch was used to prepare all three Nova Eborac obverse dies.

**"O" Punch:** The same "O" punch was used to prepare all three Nova Eborac obverse dies.

**"V" Punch:** The same "V" punch was used to prepare all Nova Eborac dies.

**"A" Punches:** Both "A" punches are the same width and height. The difference between the two punches is in the height of the horizontal cross stroke. The 1st "A" punch has a high horizontal stroke, while the horizontal stroke of the 2nd "A" is lower. The 1st "A" was used to prepare all three obverse dies. However, the "A" in EBORAC of the obverse 1 legend was punched with the 2nd "A".

**"E" Punches:** Three different "E" punches were used to prepare the Nova Eborac dies. The 1st and 2nd "E" punches are the same width and height. The difference between these two punches is in the length of the middle horizontal stroke. The middle stroke is longer in the 2nd "E" punch.. The 3rd "E" punch is significantly larger, both in width and height, than the other two. FilmPrint study shows that the 3rd "E" punch was also used to prepare the 1787 Connecticut "Muttonhead" copper dies, Miller 1.2-C.

**"B" Punch:** The same "B" punch was used to prepare all Nova Eborac dies.

**"R" Punches:** Both "R" punches are the same width and height. The 2nd "R" slants to the right of vertical and its diagonal stroke is more pointed and gracefully formed than the 1st "R" punch. Also, the bottoms of the vertical and diagonal strokes project an arc in the 2nd "R", while the bottoms of the 1st "R" project a straight line.

**"C" Punch:** The same "C" punch was used to prepare all three Nova Eborac obverse dies.


**"I" Punch:** The same "I" punch was used to prepare all four Nova Eborac reverse dies.

**"T" Punch:** The same "T" punch was used to prepare all four Nova Eborac reverse dies.

**Letter "L":** The letter "L" that is found on all four reverse Nova Eborac dies, was a made-up letter. It was formed by first punching an "I" and then the horizontal stroke and serif were hand engraved into the die. The "L" letters in each reverse die are the same height, but differ in width due to the hand engraving.

**Quatrefoil:** The same, somewhat asymmetrical, quatrefoil punctuates all of the legends except for the "small head" variety, where it was not used.

This study confirms that all four Nova Eborac varieties are indeed interlocked via the same numeral and letter punches. This condition strongly argues that all of the Nova Eborac dies were prepared by the same engraver (probably John Bailey) and that the coppers were struck by the same group of coiners. Therefore, the "small head" variety is not a contemporary counterfeit. Importantly, this study also provides additional evidence that the Connecticut "Muttonhead" coppers of 1787 were also struck by this same coinage operation noted, however, that punch comparison study is not an exact science. Several factors must be taken into consideration when comparing the same punched characters (either letter, numeral, or ornamental device). The overall widths and heights of two characters that were punched into separate dies with the same punch will be nearly the same. But, the outline of the character on the coins struck from these dies can vary, sometimes significantly. The differences that can arise start with the die preparation. When the character was punched into the dies, the engraver may have punched one character deeper into one die than the other. Since the sides of the punch were tapered, it results in a difference in the width of the strokes that make-up the character. Furthermore, the engraver may have punched one character into the die at a different angle than the other. When a character is not punched perpendicularly into a die, the width of the character strokes can vary (either increase or decrease) along their length. Also, the engraver may have touched up the character by hand on one die and not the other. Another important factor is that collars were not used with the dies. Thus, striking pressure and the softness of the copper blank determines the amount of radial expansion during striking and how well the metal flowed into the character on the die. Die and coin wear will also change the appearance of the character. Therefore, the early American coinage researcher must expect to see variations (usually minor) between characters on coppers that were struck from dies prepared with the same punches. And he must be able to recognize when this difference is a result of the many preceding factors or is indeed due to a different punch.



## **Cecil Calvert's Coinage for Maryland**

### **A Study In History and Law**

by Michael Hodder  
Wolfboro, NH

(TN-152)

From 1649 to 1660 there was no king in England. Charles I had been beheaded and Oliver Cromwell then ruled England and her overseas dominions. During these 11 years of interregnum two numismatic developments occurred that have great importance to collectors of early American coins. In 1652 the colony of the Massachusetts Bay decided to strike its own coins and in 1659 Cecil Calvert ordered coins for his colony of Maryland. Some numismatic historians have explained the origins of these two coinages similarly, theorizing that both Massachusetts and Calvert took advantage of the fact that since there was no king on the throne nothing could stop them from coining silver in their own names. Broader historical reasons were in play in both cases, however.

The colony of Massachusetts Bay was living through one of its irridentist phases in the 1650's. The Pequot War (1636-37) had expanded Massachusetts' claims to authority south into Rhode Island and Connecticut and west to the Hudson River and New York. In 1643 Massachusetts entered into the loose union called the United Colonies of New England, which it fully expected to dominate eventually. Three years later Governor Winthrop dared to defend his colony's legal system by writing that "Our allegiance binds us not to the laws of England any longer than while we live in England." Southern New Hampshire was effectively annexed in 1643. In 1652 Massachusetts Bay annexed southern coastal towns in Maine, established its own mint, and declared itself a commonwealth independent of England. Massachusetts' silver coins were an expression of sovereignty, of independence, and in 1684 its assumption of the coinage prerogative was one of the reasons given for the suspension of its charter.

Cecil Calvert, second Baron Baltimore (1606-1675) was an English Catholic who held his title in the Irish peerage. The charter that gave him Maryland had been drafted for his father George but signed by Charles I after his father's death late in 1632. In 1659, when Calvert had his coins struck, he lived in a fiercely Protestant country which abhorred both Catholics and all things Irish. Further, he exercised his rights over Maryland by virtue of a charter granted by the very king Cromwell's government had rebelled against, captured, tried, and executed. On its face, Calvert's position could not have been a very comfortable one. By what right did Calvert dare to strike coins? Was it really his own portrait on the coins that caused him trouble shortly after he began making them?

Calvert's charter for Maryland was granted on June 20, 1632. It was a long document, containing 22 chapters. It was the foundation upon which all of Calvert's rights and privileges in Maryland rested, and it was to his charter that Calvert appealed when his proprietorship was contested in the 1650's. Chapter IV of the charter concluded with these words: "...with all, and singular such, and as ample rights, jurisdictions, privileges, prerogatives, royalties, liberties, immunities, and royal rights, and temporal franchises whatsoever...to be had, exercised, used, and enjoyed, as any bishop of Durham, within the bishopric or county palatine of Durham, in our kingdom of England, ever heretofore hath had, held, used, or enjoyed, or of right could, or ought to have, hold, use, or enjoy." Chapter VII gave Calvert "absolute power...to ordain, make, and enact laws, of what kind soever...", subject only to popular approval and the rights of Christians. Calvert was named captain general of the armies with full power to declare war, given the right to execute civil and criminal punishment including the capital penalty, and allowed to create his own orders of nobility. The charter concluded by saying that in any case where Calvert's rights were contested any interpretation of the charter's meanings should always be in Calvert's favor.



The charter created in Maryland a county palatine with all the rights and powers ever held by the palatine bishops of Durham. What was a county palatine? In 1765 Blackstone (I, 113) defined an ancient county palatine as one whose owner had "...*jura regalia* as fully as the king hath in his palace...", meaning that the owner had full royal rights in his domain subject only to allegiance to the king. And among these rights, anciently, was the right to coin money. The bishops of Durham had struck coins bearing royal English types but also with the initials of the bishop incumbent until about 1544. Calvert's charter gave him all rights Durham had, ever had, or ought to have had. It appears to me that Calvert read this as giving him the right to coin in his own name.

Is there anything on Calvert's coins that suggests he did so interpret his rights as to include that of coinage? The title he styles himself by, *Dominus Terrae Mariae* [Lord of Mary's Land], is interesting in this regard. It was used in the same way that the kings of England had before 1541 when describing their position as lords of Ireland. The title *dominus* did not mean king. It implied an overlord, but in the case of the lordship of Ireland was broad enough also to allow sovereignty within the lordship. Calvert's choice of title would not have been made lightly since it was pregnant with legal implications.

On the reverses of his silver coins Calvert placed his personal arms. Above the shield of the Barony of Baltimore is a peculiar coronet. It was not the baron's coronet Calvert was entitled to wear. Instead, it was the coronet of an earl. Calvert was not an earl, but this form of coronet was the closest English equivalent to the shape of a coronet of a European count palatine. One the coins there are two arcs above the coronet surmounted by an orb and a cross (an orb crucifer). These were symbols of full sovereignty allowed only to a monarch in England or a palatine count in Europe. No mere baron commanded such regalia, nor was an English earl entitled to crown his coronet with an orb crucifer.

The story of Calvert's troubles in Maryland is too long to go into here. Suffice it to say that between 1651 and 1658 his rights were attacked by Virginia, which claimed parts of Maryland; by a local rebellion; and by radical protestants in England, who claimed that Maryland was a hotbed of "papistical plots" against Parliament. For a time Calvert lost control over his colony, but when Cromwell dissolved the Long and Barebones Parliaments and made himself Lord Protector, Calvert's palatine rights in Maryland were re-affirmed. By 1658 Calvert was back in control of Maryland. The year following he ordered his coinage to be struck at the Tower Mint. The coins were as much a proclamation of his palatine rights as necessary for his colony's internal trade.

Calvert's coinage did not go uncontested, however. In October, 1659 he was attainted before the Protectorate's council on information brought by Richard Pight, the Mint clerk who had charge of the dies cut and stored there. Crosby reprinted (pp. 129-130) the council's order for a warrant against Calvert and the immediately following decision taken by the council. It has been said that Calvert's problem was that he had put his own portrait on the coinage in place of the king's, and that he was therefore guilty of treason and subject to execution (CNL, seq. p. 610). But, if we read the words of the council's order and decision, we find entirely different reasons given there.

"Tuesday, 4 Octobr, 1659

**Ld. Baltimore to be apprehended.**

Upon Information given by Richard Pight, Clerke of the Irons in the Mint, that Cicill Lord Baltamore and diverse others with him, and for him, have made and transported great Sums of mony and doe still goe on to make more,

Ordered, That a warrant be issued forth to the said Richard Pight for the apprehending of the Lord Baltamore and such others as are suspected to be ingaged with him in the said offense, and for the seizeing of all such moneys, stamps, tooles, & Instrumts for Coyning the same as can be met wth, and to bring them in safe Custody to the Counsell."

"Wednesday, 5 Octobr, 1659.

**Ld Baltimore to attend.**

The Counsell being Informed that a great quantity of Silver is coyned into peeces of diverse rates & values, and sent into Maryland by the Lo. Baltamore or his Order,

Ordered, that the said Lo. Baltamore be Surnoned to attend the Comittee of the Councell for Plantacons, who are to inquire into the whole business and to report the State thereof to the Councell."

If we analyze these records, we see that the order to arrest Calvert and his dies was issued because he was making and transporting money. Nowhere does it state that the arrest was because Calvert's portrait appeared on the money made. The order issued from the council of the Protectorate because a crime of state was believed to have been committed: the unlicensed exportation of bullion. The second order from the council is more illuminating. It states that Calvert had been found found making money that was not up to English standards and was exporting it out of the country. We should remember that Calvert's coins were made deliberately underweight (but of sterling fineness) by about 30%, in an attempt to restrict their circulation to Maryland. Massachusetts had decided upon the same expedient for its silver seven years earlier. More interestingly, the council did not decide that Calvert's actions were of immediate concern as a matter of state, since it referred the case to the "Councell for Plantacions", which had charge of matters colonial. Had Calvert been accused of a crime of state the case would have stayed with the council of the Protectorate.

It appears from these records that Calvert's "crimes" were two: making money of rates different from the Tower standard, and exporting it out of England. We have a hint of the outcome of the proceedings before the Council for Plantations in Calvert's letters of October 12, 1659 to his governor and brother in Maryland. To the former Calvert asked that the coinage be made current in Maryland by proclamation and to advise him further about the coinage "...for, if encouradgement be given by the good success of it this yeare, there wilbe abundance of adventurers In it the next yeare." To the latter, in a more open communication, Calvert wrote that if the people accept the coinage "...there wilbe means found to supply you all there with money enough..." but the coinage must not be imposed upon them. Rather, it should be accepted "...by a Lawe there made by their consents in a Generall Assembly..." One of the few restrictive clauses in Calvert's charter required that laws and civil acts made for Maryland be by and with the consent of the colonists.

If Calvert's case had been heard by the Council for Plantations and reported to the council of the Protectvrate between October 5 and 12, then Calvert's letters of October 12 suggest that his coinage right was upheld, subject only to the charter's provision of acceptance by the people in general assembly convened. A week after he had been summonsed Calvert could write that he would ship coins to Maryland if the issue was accepted there. At the very least, we may lay to rest the myth that the coinage was stopped in 1659 because it was found treasonous. We know further from Calvert's letters that only samples of the coinage had reached Maryland by that date (incidentally, the samples Calvert dispatched did not include the denarium). Yet we know that Calvert's coins were made current in 1661 and were in limited circulation in Maryland ten years later (Crosby, p. 128). Therefore, it is certain that the export of the coinage to Maryland ocured after Calvert had answered his summons.

Both Massachusetts and Cecil Calvert benefitted from the interregnum's unsettled state but neither dared to strike their coins only because of it. Massachusetts's coins were part and parcel of American puritan irridentism of the 1650's. Calvert's were a perceived right deriving from his palatine grant of Maryland, a grant which was a mediaeval holdover in a world rapidly outgrowing its roots. Neither was destined to last beyond their century.

---

**Benjamin Dudley and the Fugio Copper; Bits & Pieces of Evidence. (CS-2)**  
**Comments by ye Editor based on research notes assembled**  
**by Raymond H. Williamson; Lynchburg, VA**

About the only certain facts regarding the copper stock from which the Fugio Cents of 1787 were struck is that the copper was available some place in government storage and that 12,809 pounds of the material was made available to James Jarvis by William Duer, Secretary of the Board of Treasury, even before the contract had been awarded for production of the coinage. Eventually 71,174 and 1/2 pounds avdp. was established as the total weight of copper chargeable to Jarvis. It has always seemed unusual that such a supply would be available. That the stock would be suitable for immediate coinage seems almost impossible.

According to Damon G. Douglas [Note1], the government's accumulation of copper had commenced in 1781 in connection with Robert Morris's plans at that time for the establishment of a federal mint at Philadelphia (The Mint of North America). The records indicate that James Jarvis received the Federal Copper as follows:

12,809.0 lbs. copper on January 16, 1787 [Note2]

19,195.0 lbs. copper on February 14, 1787 [Note 3]

39,170.5 lbs. copper at later dates -- calculated from the total, below.

71,174.5 lbs. copper TOTAL valued at \$14,828.01 [Note 4]

Douglas states that the Government's total stock of copper was "approximately 37 tons" [Note 5], so apparently Jarvis managed to get his hands on all of it! The unanswered question has remained -- when and how did the Government acquire "37 tons" of copper suitable for coinage purposes? The records are silent on the exact condition of the copper transferred to Jarvis but the implications seem to be that this copper was in a form that was ready for coinage, or could be made ready with a minimum of work.

Throughout many of the various related references to copper to be found in the extant public records -- the name of Benjamin Dudley appears numerous times. If one pieces together the bits and pieces of these various reports an almost inescapable story appears to emerge, and this is that Benjamin Dudley, while accomplishing the preliminary work to establish the Mint of North America on an operable basis, refined and rolled the copper, and this copper was eventually transferred to James Jarvis following the demise of the "Mint of North America".

The "37 tons" was but a fraction of the total copper needed by Jarvis to complete his contract. He was some 263 tons short of the total requirements necessary to fulfill the contract [Note 6], and hence made his trip to Europe attempting to locate an additional source. A trip which, as we know, failed and ultimately led to his default on the contract and a court judgement of \$10,842.24 against him, which was never collected.

Of the "37 tons", apparently the 398,577 Fugios delivered to the Government were produced with the balance of the copper going "under the table" into the production of Connecticut Coppers by Jarvis' "Company for Coining Coppers".

CNL Patron Raymond H. Williamson of Lynchburg, Virginia during the year 1953/54 served as Chairman of the ANS Committee on United States Coins and during that time researched and collected a number of facts gleaned from various letters and other Governmental correspondence and organized them into an unsuccessful proposal for a "Source Book of American Numismatics" to document key resources which might be used later during Bicentennial or other appropriate activities. During a vacation trip several years ago ye Editor visited with Ray and his wife Hazel in Lynchburg and during our visit Ray loaned us a copy of his draft "Source Book" with the comment that "I believe that this indicates where the copper for the Fugio cents came from!" After studying Ray's Source Book and other notes that he had accumulated on the subject, ye Editor believes that the source of most of the copper supplied to James Jarvis can now be accounted for. Since this material is still highly speculative and much additional research is needed, ye Editor has categorized this article in our Conjecture and Speculation listing as CS-2.

The key element is a letter dated 28 June 1781 from John Bradford, Continental Agent in Boston, to Samuel Huntington, President of the Continental Congress, in Philadelphia. The letter deals with two subjects, the first being Duck (Canvas for Sails), and the second being Rough Copper in Naval Stores. This letter is quoted in its entirety:

[Source - Papers of the Continental Congress, (Record Group) RG-11, Item 8, Vol.IV pp 225-6]

[DUCK OR CANVAS FOR SAILS]

I am honored with your Excellency's Letter Respecting the delivery of all the Duck in my possession to the order of the quartermaster General. I have accordingly delivered one hundred and thirteen Bales Russia Duck, Reserving four hundred peices [sic] for the use of the Navy, which no doubt the hon<sup>ble</sup> Congress supposed when they passed that resolve to deliver the whole, that the Navy Board had their Supply agreeable to a former order given by the Admiralty [.] But the Board to Save the Expense of portage left it with me, to take it as they had occasion for it.

[ROUGH COPPER IN NAVAL STORES]

I beg leave to mention to your Excellency that we have a large quantity of rough Copper laying in the Stores upwards of two years, it has always been supposed that it was sent with a design to mix with other metals for the purpose of Casting Brass Cannon, it is a sort of copper in so rough a State, as has not been seen among us, I have had the Opinion of several of our most ingenious artisans respecting the quality of it, who all were of the same sentiment, that it was scarcely worth the freight.

[BEN]AMIN DUDLEY, COINER]

But two days ago I had an Essay [sic] made by a Mr. Dudley, and we find it to be the purest Copper, he melted down about two pounds into three ingots, and we find no dross among it. Mr. Dudley assures me that he can Roll it into Sheets of any thickness and Can either harden or soften it. We find it to be very malleable, he tells me that if Congress shou'd see fit to Strike of [sic] a parcel of Coppers for a Currency he can make the Apparatus and go through the whole process. This gentlemen comes to America highly recommended as a warm friend to our cause and being possessed of a most uncommon extensive Genius. A Doctor Peirce [sic] who was his patron left London with him to Come over via France in Order to bring over some Arts unknown to us, but the Doctor was advertised and a large reward offered to Stop him for taking Mr. Dudley out of the kingdom, they but Just escaped being taken. The Character of both those Gentlemen are known to my son as being acquainted with them ten months in France. The Doctor is waiting a favourable Opportunity to get to America. Mr. Dudley has already given such proofs of his ingenuity that I can view him as an important acquisition to this infant nation, and hope he will meet with encouragement.

[DISPOSITION OF LETTER OF 28 JUNE 1781]

Ordered. [9 July 1791]

that so much thereof as relates to duck be referred to the Board of War; and

That so much thereof as relates to copper be referred to the superintendent of finance. [Robert Morris]

A follow-up on this subject appears in a 16 July 1781 entry in a Diary in the Office of Finance [Robert Morris] in Philadelphia:

"Wrote to Mr. [Benjamin] Dudley at Boston inviting him hither in consequence of the Continental Agent Mr. [John] Bradford's Letter [of 28 June 1781] respecting him referred to me by Congress". [On 9 July 1781.]

Another diary entry for 17 July 1781 states:

"Wrote Mr. [John] Bradford [Continental Agent in Boston] respecting Mr. [Benjamin] Dudley".

The two letters referenced above were searched for but not found in microfilm of *Papers of Robert Morris*, Official Letterbook "A", 13 March 1781 through 29 September 1781.

Thus ends the rather cryptic correspondence regarding Benjamin Dudley and the Naval Store of copper which we surmise was smelted by Dudley and rolled, along with later supplies, for use at the proposed "Mint of North America" only to be used, instead, some five years later in the production of Fugio Cents and Connecticut Coppers! Hopefully some time in the future some of the missing letters and other records will be located to help fill in the many gaps in this episode.

#### SUMMARY of REFERENCES TO "FEDERAL COPPER" DURING 1781-1786

1781	28 June	
1781	9 July	
1781	16 July	
1781	17 July	The Source Book citations presented in the main text.

Non-Source Book citations are as follow:

1781	29 November	(After entries re copper in Robert Morris's Daybook dated 25 Sept., 17 Oct., 26 Oct., & 29 Nov., we find:) "Sunday . . . This day the Brigantine <i>Activee</i> , Capt. Hodge, a packet belonging to the United States arrived (in Philadelphia) from Boston with Copper &c as per Mr. Brown's letter and Invoice."
1782	14 January	(R. Morris's Daybook): "Mr. Tench Francis [Note 7] wrote me a note requesting that he might use some of the copper deposited at the Bank (of North America) to make weights for the use of the said Bank, this I agreed to, he taking account of the Weight & the Bank paying for it . . ." R. Morris's Letterbook same date: "Office of Finance to Tench Francis, Esqr: use so much of the copper in the Bank cellar as may be sufficient to make weights for the Bank taking an account of the quantity so used . . ." (Signed) "J. L. Clarkson, Sec'y."
1782	15 January	W. T. Thompson in <i>Numismatic Scrapbook Magazine</i> Nov. 1959 pp 2712 & 2717 "The Mint of North America and its Coinage"; Footnote 1, p. 2717 "The Journal shows that this copper amounted to 17 tons and that Benjamin Flower, Commissioner of Military Stores was paid \$2630.12 in the transfer. The receipt was issued by Benjamin Dudley. Later entries show that this copper was sold to James Jarvis to be used for the Fugio Cents." Thompson's citation is not very precise; I think he means what are called "Waste Books" in National Archives Record Group G 217. They are kept in Dollars and 90ths, written like Dollars and cents. There is also a reference on this item in the <i>American Journal of Numismatics</i> of January 1871.

- 1782 16 January R. Morris's Daybook: "Mr. B. Dudley to whom I gave an order on Mr. Swanwick for fifty dollars, and desired him to seek after Mr. Wheeler to know whether the rollers &c are ready for him to go to work on rolling the copper for the Mint."
- 1783 2 April In "Journal B", Register's Office, National Archives RG 217, p 593: "Benjamin Dudley his receipt for 17 ton 2 lb of Rough Copper &c Debtor, to Benjamin Flower late Commiss<sup>y</sup> Genl Military Stores, his a/c of Public Stores. Voucher 3024, page 909."
- and ... page 741: "For Two Thousand six hundred and thirty dollars 12/90, \$2630.12"
- 1786 19 Sept. Forty casks of rough copper and ten casks of copper nails were purchased from Edward Russell of Boston and shipped from Boston to New York by packet, Thomas Bernard collecting \$40.00 freight charges thereon. [after Douglas]

### NOTES

- [1] *James Jarvis and the Fugio Coppers* by Damon G. Douglas.  
Unpublished manuscript at the American Numismatic Society Library in New York City. Excerpts from this manuscript have appeared in *The Colonial Newsletter*, sequential page numbers 261, 273, 285 and 578.
- [2] Douglas note 47: (His note 68 cited). Note 68 states:  
  
Letter of Ns. Eveleigh, Comptroller of the Treasury, to William Duer March 4, 1791, mss. William Duer Papers, II, 80, New York Historical Society Library.
- [3] Douglas note 79: Note 68. [As above]
- [4] Douglas note 76: Auditor's Voucher No. 1671, Oct. 17, 1791, General Accounting Office Washington, D.C.
- [5] We can assume that throughout the various discussions and references quoted herein, that the weights of copper were almost certainly stated in long tons of 2240 pounds avdp. Douglas' statement regarding "approximately 37 tons" does not appear to be accurate when compared with the total assessed against Jarvis by the Court. 71,174.5 lbs. avdp. converts to 31.88 long tons or 35.58 short tons. Accordingly we have used the expression "37 tons" to be the total amount of copper obtained by Jarvis as expressed by Douglas who may have used some other formula than that used by the Court to assess the amount due from Jarvis.
- [6] The original Fugio contract was for 300 tons of coins.
- [7] Tench Francis was the Cashier of The Bank of North America. *A History of the Bank of North America* (1882) Lawrence Lewis, Jr., p.5.
- [8] In the main text and summary, editorial comments, clarifications, corrections, references to notes, etc. are shown in [brackets] or (parentheses).

**TWO NEW YORK THEATER TOKENS FOR SALE:  
HOW MANY ARE REALLY OUT THERE?****(TN-153)**

from Donald Scarinci; Waldwick; NJ

The appearance of two New York Theater tokens, one in Early American Numismatic Auctions, August 9, 1992 sale and another in Stack's Fall Fixed Price List, provides an opportunity to reflect on the rarity of this item.

The New York Theater token is listed, but not plated in the current Red Book<sup>1</sup>. The Coin World Comprehensive Catalog and Encyclopedia of United States Coins illustrates the Oechsner Theater token and states that "It is unlikely that this token was ever seen in America until after the birth of numismatics in the U.S. decades later."<sup>2</sup>

Silvester S. Crosby doesn't even list the New York token in Early Coins of America.<sup>3</sup> Rulau lists two varieties of the Theater at New York token, one with edge lettering and one without. He also states that "This penny token, designed by Jacobs and struck in England by Skidmore, was issued by the Park Theater in New York."<sup>4</sup>

Walter Breen tells the story of the Park Theater located in New York City from the 1790's to its reopening in the 1820's. He provides the accepted origination of the piece as follows:

"The penny is uniform with the remainder of the series of notable buildings depicted on penny tokens by the engraver Jacobs for Skidmore, the coin dealer and iron monger of High Holborn Street, London."<sup>5</sup>

The Theater at New York token is described by several catalogers as having a stock English commerce reverse with the obverse depicting a building. The token is similar in size and style to the Kempson series of London buildings depicted on tokens listed as Middlesex tokens by Dalton & Hammer, 42-III<sup>6</sup>

In his description of Skidmore's Globe Series, Davisson notes that "Bell, The Building Medalets of Kemson and Skidmore, explains that these pieces were struck for Denton, a coin dealer in London, for sale to collectors. The Globe die failed soon and all the issues are scarce to very rare. This series includes buildings from locations other than London and the pieces are assigned to both locations by Dalton & Hamer. They are listed under London because Dalton & Hamer photographed them for the London section."<sup>7</sup>

It is probable that the Theater at New York token was produced as part of this series and has even less to do with early America than is supposed, other than to depict an Early American building. Nevertheless, the token is a rarity, and the opportunity to examine two separate specimens at the 1992 ANA Convention in Orlando provided an occasion to attempt a census of the known specimens.

As with most rare colonial issues, catalogers do not agree on the exact number of specimens known of this token. Walter Breen estimates that 10—12 are known. Michael Hodder, cataloging the specimen in Stack's in Fall 1992 sale estimates that fewer than 15 specimens survive today. This writer presents the following opening salvo for the consideration of CNL patrons. I would like to encourage anyone with knowledge of additional specimens that can be distinguished from those listed below to contact the author at P.O. Box 176, Waldwick, New Jersey 07463. Unless advised to keep information confidential, it would be interesting and informative to publish a revised census in a future edition of this publication.

1 [for notes see page 1369]

## Census of [1796 - 1797] Theater at New York tokens

1. **Plate coin, complete encyclopedia of U.S. and colonial coins**, Walter Breen.
2. **Bowers & Merena, Garrett III, October, 1980, Lot 1529.** "409.8 grains. Edge lettered. The present example is a choice proof piece with light golden toning." This coin was obtained by John Work Garrett from Wayte Raymond on December 1, 1922.
3. **Stack's, Roper, December, 1983, Lot 355.** This is the same coin as Stack's, Laird U. Park, May 26, 1976, Lot 76. "406.0 grains. Edge lettered: I promise to pay on demand the bearer one penny. A lovely dark brown with traces of original mint red. Choice proof." Plated in black and white and color.
4. **Stack's, 6/73, Lot 855.** The coin in the Stack's 6/73 sale, Lot 855, is likely the same coin from New Netherland's 51st Sale catalog of June 1958, Lot 180. This coin is also the likely suspect for the plate coin in Early American Tokens by Russell Rulau, Third Edition, Krause Publications, Wisconsin, 1991.

Stack's, 6/73 describes the token as: "A gorgeous light chestnut brown, with bluish overtones. Two microscopic chips out of the planchet in the reverse field above the ship (as made). Otherwise perfect and nicer than the few others we've seen." This coin is described as "Proof" with no mention of edge lettering. This piece is pictured in Taxay according to the cataloger in Pine Tree, May 1974 (The Promised Land Sale, Lot 315.)

In New Netherland's 51st sale, Lot 180, the token is described as: "A magnificent medium olive proof with partial bluish iridescence. Some minor granular planchet imperfections as made, and the most trivial evidence of handling (less so, than upon the few other impressions of this large, heavy piece we have seen)."
5. **Stack's, Roblson, February, 1982, Lot 210.** 403.4 grains. Lettered edge. Choice proof. Plated in black and white and color in that catalog. This coin reappeared in Mid-American, 5/87, as Lot 717 where it was described as "Choice proof 63/63. The color is an even, iridescent brown".
6. **Pine Tree Rare Coin; The Promised Lands Sale, May, 1974, Lot 315.** Edge lettering. "Brilliant proof, mint red paling and beginning to tone down a little; several minute prestriking planchet chips in central reverse, small old stain above space right of middle arch." Plated.
7. **ANS Exhibition of U.S. and Colonial Coins, January 17, 1914**, plate coin from Plate 7. The H. Ryder Collection.
8. **ANS Collection, The Gift of Daniel Parish, Jr. on November 22, 1887.**
9. **Early American Numismatic Auctions, August, 1992, Lot 101.** Plated.
10. **Bowers & Merena, 3/89 (Four Landmark Collections), Lot 5152** described there as "Proof 60, 404.8 grains. Rich, deep and attractive golden brown. Highly reflective surfaces. Reverse die sinking at the rim from 12:00 to 3:00, as often seen (see Norwebb: 1411 and Garrett 1529). Plated. This coin was previously offered on 4/88 from Stack's as Lot 2026 where it was described as "Purplish brown with some original red in the protected areas, choice proof".
11. **Stack's, 10/87, Lot 58.** Described as "A lovely iridescent brown with traces of original mint red. Brilliant proof." Plated in black and white and color. There are some marks below the A extending to below the E at the obverse.



**12. Stack's, Herbert M. Oechsner, September, 1988, Lot 1367.** This is the same coin offered for sale in Stack's Fixed Price List Fall, 1992 as Lot 378, and the CCE plate coin. In Stack's Fixed Price List, Lot 378, the coin is described as: 404.9 grains. Edge lettered. "Struck slightly off center on both sides but affecting only the reverse denticles at upper left. Very late states of the dies, the reverse particularly, sinking peripherally around and most noticeable at upper right. About uncirculated. Plated.

**13. Stack's, Gilbert Steinberg, October, 1989, Lot 181.** 407.9 grains. Steinberg, Lot 181, 407.9 grains. Lettered edge. "An usually well-centered example with most of the denticles showing. Early die state, no bulge at right reverse. Struck on a slightly defective planchet with minor chips and a few hairlines. Extremely fine or a bit better. Plated in black and white and color.

### NOTES

- <sup>1</sup> A Guide Book of U.S. Coins, 46th Edition, by R.S. Yeoman, Racine, Wisconsin, 1992.
- <sup>2</sup> Comprehensive Catalog & Encyclopedia of U.S. Coins, edited by David T. Alexander, Amos Press, Sidney, Ohio, 1990.
- <sup>3</sup> Early Coins of America, Silvester S. Crosby, reprint by Durst, New York, New York, 1983.
- <sup>4</sup> Early American Tokens, by Russell Rulaw, 3rd Edition, Krause Publications, Iola, Wisconsin, 1991.
- <sup>5</sup> Complete Encyclopedia of U.S. and Colonial Coins, Walter Breen, Doubleday, New York, New York, 1988.
- <sup>6</sup> 18th Century Tokens as Cataloged by Dalton & Hammer, Allen Davisson, Cold Springs, Minnesota, 1991, Page 48 to 51.
- <sup>7</sup> Id.



**That BLANK Planchet?**  
from Gary A. Trudgen; Endwell NY

(TN-145A)

I have just received CNL No. 91 and find it jam packed with interesting articles. In looking at the photos of the "Blank Planchet?" that Pete Boisvert sent you, I see what appears to be some letters at the top of the left photo. The letter "R" appears just past 12 O'clock and some remnants of other letters are to the left of it. Also near the bottom of the same photo, I see what may be some more letters. The letters appear to be following the circumference of the planchet. Could this have been a well worn copper which was then severely mistreated?

**Editors Note:** Could be! The photograph was made using a quasi-brightfield technique that often will show minor surface disturbances not visible to the naked eye! Perhaps Pete will re-examine his planchet, now that we have an idea of where to look, and let us know whether or not there is any visual evidence of lettering.

JCS



## New 1787 Connecticut Variety 49.2-Z.1 Discovered from Michael Hodder; Wolfeboro, NH

(TN-154)

A new 1787 Draped Bust Connecticut variety has been discovered. The coin was found unattributed in a dealer's stock, where it had been unrecognized for nearly 30 years.

The new variety is a new marriage of previously known dies. It combines obverse 49.2 and reverse Z.1. The obverse die is currently Rarity-8, with only two examples known (the other being the unique 49.2-Z.26 discovered a few years ago). The reverse is well known through its marriages to obverses 33.13, 33.19, 33.35, 33.38, 33.40, and 49.1.



New  
Connecticut 49.2-Z.1  
2x Enlargement

The unique 49.2-Z.1 technically grades Choice EF. The fields are dark brown, the devices lighter in color. Both surfaces are rough and granular. There is a small planchet flaw to the right of the wreath, about three-quarters down from the top. The coin weighs a robust 153.2 grains. It is 28.4mm in diameter along both the horizontal and vertical axes. Its reverse die was aligned at 170°.

The obverse die was clearly failing linearly diagonally from 9-4:00, with a consequent bulge along this axis and loss of central detail. The same failure can be seen on the 49.2-Z.26 specimen. This probably accounts for the die's rarity. The reverse was failing on Liberty's feet and the exergual line to the right of the date, there is evidence of clashing around the periphery, and the die was broken from the rim at 5:00 into the shield. This appears to be the latest state of Z.1 and can also be seen on 33.40-Z.1.

A proposed die emission sequence for reverse Z.1 would show 33.13-Z.1 and 33.38-Z.1 struck first, followed in turn by 33.35-Z.1, 33.19-Z.1, 49.1-Z.1, finally 33.40-Z.1 and the new 49.2-Z.1.